UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,459	06/29/2001	Seong Jun Yoon	P-0229	6348

34610 7590 12/15/2005

FLESHNER & KIM, LLP
P.O. BOX 221200
CHANTILLY, VA 20153

EXAMINER	
DAVIS, CYNTHIA L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2665	

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/893,459	YOON, SEONG JUN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cynthia L. Davis	2665	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 October 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 10/13/2005, with respect to the rejection(s)of claim(s) 1-25 over the Bjorkvist reference have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the Christie reference (6081525).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 5- 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christie.

Regarding claim 5, a MTP3 L3 protocol integrating apparatus of a network is disclosed in Christie, figure 6, element 610, and column 12, lines 49-50. A data managing unit storing a user data related to the N-ISUP and the B-ISUP networks, a signal link managing unit managing a signal link of the N-ISUP and B-ISUP networks, a signal link set managing unit managing a signal link set of the N-ISUP and the B-ISUP networks, a signal route managing unit managing a signal route of the N-ISUP and the B-ISUP networks, and an internal managing unit controlling the signal link managing unit, the signal link set managing unit, and the signal route managing unit is disclosed in Christie, column 6, line 49-column 7, line 12 (disclosing a management module and conversion tables that hold signaling and routing information about the networks). A primitive managing unit for determining whether a received message is the N-ISUP

message type or the B- ISUP message type and a message distribution managing unit transmitting an originating N-ISUP or B-ISUP message from the primitive managing unit through the activated N- ISUP network or the B-ISUP network to an ISDN user part based on the determined message type are not specifically disclosed in Christie. However, Christie discloses in column 11, lines 16-22 and column 13, lines 3-6, that the MTP unit may have both N-ISUP and B-ISUP capability. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the system of Christie determine whether a message is N-ISUP or B-ISUP and route it to the appropriate network. The motivation would be to route messages to their appropriate destination.

Regarding claim 6, an originating point code, a destination point code, a signal link, a signal link set and a signal route related to the N-ISUP network and the B-ISUP network is disclosed in column 10, line 66-column 11, line 3.

Regarding claim 7, a message transfer part level 3 protocol integrating method of a network is disclosed in Christie, figure 6, element 610, and column 12, lines 49-50. Registering a user data related to a N-ISUP message type or a B-ISUP message type, activating the N-ISUP network or the B-ISUP network according to a user control instruction and the registered user data; determining that a received message is a N-ISUP message type and transmitting a N-ISUP message through the activated N-ISUP network to the ISDN user part based on the determined message type is disclosed in Christie, column 11, lines 16-22 (disclosing determining whether a call is N-ISUP, and routing the call appropriately). Determining that another received message is a B-ISUP message type and transmitting a B-ISUP message through the activated B-ISUP

network to the ISDN user part based on the determined message type is not specifically disclosed in Christie, however, Christie does disclose in column 13, lines 3-6, that it is known in the art to have B-ISUP capability in a MTP module in addition to N-ISUP capability, which would be used to route B-ISUP calls on a B-ISUP network. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to route a B-ISUP message to a B-ISUP network in the system of Christie. The motivation would be to route a type of message that is well known in the art. That the determining is based on a code within the received message is not specifically disclosed in Christie, however, Christie does disclose in column 17, line 67-column 18, line 1, that a message type may be included in a message. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a code in the messages to indicate the type of message. The motivation would be to easily identify the type of message for routing purposes.

Regarding claim 14, a message transfer part level 3 protocol integrating method of a network is disclosed in Christie, figure 6, element 610, and column 12, lines 49-50. Registering a user data related to a N-ISUP message type or a B-ISUP message type, activating the N-ISUP network according to a user control instruction and the registered user data; determining that a received message is a N-ISUP message type and transmitting a corresponding message through the activated N-ISUP network to the ISDN user part based on the determined message type is disclosed in Christie, column 11, lines 16-22 (disclosing determining whether a call is N-ISUP, and routing the call appropriately). Activating the B-ISUP network and determining that another received message is a B-ISUP message type and transmitting corresponding message through

the activated B-ISUP network to the ISDN user part based on the determined message type is not specifically disclosed in Christie, however, Christie does disclose in column 13, lines 3-6, that it is known in the art to have B-ISUP capability in a MTP module in addition to N-ISUP capability, which would be used to route B-ISUP calls on a B-ISUP network. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to route a B-ISUP message to a B-ISUP network in the system of Christie. The motivation would be to route a type of message that is well known in the art. That the determining is based on a code within the received message is not specifically disclosed in Christie, however, Christie does disclose in column 17, line 67-column 18, line 1, that a message type may be included in a message. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a code in the messages to indicate the type of message. The motivation would be to easily identify the type of message for routing purposes.

Regarding claims 8 and 15, the user data refers to an originating point code, a destination point code, a signal link, a signal link set and a signal route related to the N-ISUP network and the B-ISUP network is disclosed in column 10, line 66-column 11, line 3.

Regarding claims 9 and 16, in the user data registering step, the originating point code and the destination point code to be connected to each other are registered as the same type of ISUP is not specifically disclosed in Christie's transmission method, detailed in column 11, lines 16-22. However, registering the points to be connected as

the same type would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention. The motivation would be to describe the call.

Regarding claims 10 and 17, in the user data registering step, if the destination signal point is N-ISUP the signal link is registered as N-ISUP, and where if the destination signal print is B-ISUP the signal link is registered as B-ISUP is not specifically disclosed in Christie's transmission method, detailed in column 11, lines 16-22. However, registering the signal link as the destination type would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention in the invention. The motivation would be to describe the call.

Regarding claims 11 and 18, in the user data registering step, if the destination point code and the signal link are the N-ISUP the signal link set is registered as N-ISUP, and where if the destination point code and the signal link are B-ISUP, the signal link set is registered as B-ISUP is not specifically disclosed in Christie's transmission method, detailed in column 11, lines 16-22. However, registering the signal link set as the destination type would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention. The motivation would be to describe the call.

Regarding claims 12 and 19, in the user data registering step, if the destination point code and the destination point code in the signal route are the N-ISUP the signal route is registered as N-ISUP, and where if the destination point code and the destination point code in the signal route are B-ISUP the signal route is registered as B-ISUP is not specifically disclosed in Christie's transmission method, detailed in column 11, lines 16-22. However, registering the signal route as the destination type would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention in the invention. The motivation would be to describe the call.

Regarding claims 13 and 20, the type of the received message is determined by comparing the originating point code and the destination point code included in the received message to the originating point code and the destination point code of the user data is disclosed in column 22, lines 20-22 (if the message has the same OPC and DPC that the IAM did, it is for the same call; determining that is it the same call will also determine the message type, as that is known for the call).

Regarding claim 21, receiving the N-ISUP message from an MTP level 2 protocol prior to determining the type of the received message is disclosed in is disclosed in column 12, lines 47-66 (disclosing MTP levels 2 and 3 working together in the MTP unit).

Regarding claim 22, receiving the B-ISUP message from an asynchronous transfer mode adaptation layer prior to determining the type of the received message is disclosed in Christie, figure 1, element 150 (showing an ATM cross-connection unit).

Regarding claim 23, transmitting comprising a coupling an internal managing unit to the N-ISUP and B-ISUP networks is not specifically disclosed in Christie. However, Christie does disclose in column 13, lines 3-6 and column 11, lines 16-22 that the system routes both N-ISUP and B-ISUP calls. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to couple to the N-ISUP and B-ISUP networks. The motivation would be to be able to send messages on the networks.

Regarding claim 25, the protocol integrating unit comprising a single unit is disclosed in Christie, figure 6, element 610.

3. Claims 1-4 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christie in view of Baumgartner.

Regarding claim 1, a message transfer part (MTP) level 3 protocol integrating apparatus of a network is disclosed in Christie, figure 6, element 610, and column 12, lines 49-50. A narrowband-ISDN user part (N-ISUP) network is disclosed in Christie, column 11, lines 16-22. A broadband-ISDN user part (B-ISUP) network is disclosed in column 13, lines 3-6. A MTP level 3 protocol integrating unit receiving a predetermined message from a lower layer of protocol and determining whether the message is a N-ISUP message type, the MTP level 3 protocol integrating unit interfacing the corresponding message to the N-ISUP network according to the determined message type of the predetermined message, and the MTP level 3 protocol integrating unit being capable of interfacing an N-ISUP message to the N-ISUP network is disclosed in Christie, column 11, lines 16-22 (disclosing determining whether a call is N-ISUP, and routing the call appropriately). Determining whether the message is a B-ISUP message type and interfacing the B-ISUP message to the B-ISUP network is not specifically disclosed in Christie, however, Christie does disclose in column 13, lines 3-6, that it is known in the art to have B-ISUP capability in a MTP module in addition to N-ISUP capability, which would be used to route B-ISUP calls on a B-ISUP network. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to route a B-ISUP message to a B-ISUP network in the system of Christie. The motivation would

be to route a type of message that is well known in the art. That the determining is based on a code within the received message is not specifically disclosed in Christie, however, Christie does disclose in column 17, line 67-column 18, line 1, that a message type may be included in a message. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to include a code in the messages to indicate the type of message. The motivation would be to easily identify the type of message for routing purposes. The networks being interfaced simultaneously is missing from Christie. However, Baumgartner discloses in figure 3 and column 4, lines 33-35, a multicast operation simultaneously sending out messages to different networks. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to simultaneously interface the networks as is taught by Baumgartner in the invention of Christie. The motivation would be to be able to send messages to both networks at the same time.

Regarding claim 2, a data managing unit storing a user data related to the N-ISUP and the B-ISUP networks, a signal link managing unit managing a signal link of the N-ISUP and B-ISUP networks, a signal link set managing unit managing a signal link set of the N-ISUP and the B-ISUP networks, a signal route managing unit managing a signal route of the N-ISUP and the B-ISUP networks, and an internal managing unit controlling the signal link managing unit, the signal link set managing unit, and the signal route managing unit is disclosed in Christie, column 6, line 49-column 7, line 12 (disclosing a management module and conversion tables that hold signaling and routing information about the networks). A primitive managing unit for determining whether a received message is the N-ISUP message type or the B- ISUP message type and a

message distribution managing unit transmitting an originating N-ISUP or B-ISUP message from the primitive managing unit through the activated N- ISUP network or the B-ISUP network to an ISDN user part based on the determined message type are not specifically disclosed in Christie. However, Christie discloses in column 11, lines 16-22 and column 13, lines 3-6, that the MTP unit may have both N-ISUP and B-ISUP capability. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to have the system of Christie determine whether a message is N-ISUP or B-ISUP and route it to the appropriate network. The motivation would be to route messages to their appropriate destination.

Regarding claim 3, the primitive managing unit compares an originating signal point code and a destination point code included in the received message to an originated sign point code and a destination point code stored in the data managing unit in order to determine a message type is disclosed in column 22, lines 20-22 (if the message has the same OPC and DPC that the IAM did, it is for the same call, the OPC and DPC are stored; determining that is it the same call will also determine the message type, as that is known for the call).

Regarding claim 4, an originating point code, a destination point code, a signal link, a signal link set and a signal route related to the N-ISUP network and the B-ISUP network is disclosed in column 10, line 66-column 11, line 3.

Regarding claim 24, the protocol integrating unit comprising a single unit to couple to each of the B-ISUP and N-ISUP networks is disclosed in Christie, figure 6, element 610, column 11, lines 16-22 (N-ISUP) and column 13, lines 3-6 (B-ISUP).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cynthia L. Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3117. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 6, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CLD
12/6/2005

CLD 12/6/05

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600